



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

19

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/645,761

08/18/2003

Ulrich Feige

A-527D

8846

21069

7590

05/31/2006

EXAMINER

HUFF, SHEELA JITENDRA

AMGEN INC.

MAIL STOP 28-2-C

ONE AMGEN CENTER DRIVE

THOUSAND OAKS, CA 91320-1799

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1643

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,761

Applicant(s)

FEIGE ET AL.

Examiner

Sheela J. Huff

Art Unit

1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/18/03; 5/2/06
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7 are pending.

Claims 8-51 have been cancelled.

Priority

Applicant is requested to update the status of the parent application in the first line of the specification.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 8/18/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

Specifically, all the references have been considered except for B1-B3, B46 and B48. These were not filed in the parent application. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 is enclosed.

Drawings

The drawings filed 8/18/03 are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

Art Unit: 1643

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. THIS IS A NEW MATTER REJECTION.

The newly amended claims are directed to a composition of matter wherein P1-P4 are randomized NGF binding peptides. The specification as originally filed does not contemplate NGF binding peptides.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to compositions of matter comprising NGF binding peptides. The specification provides no description of any NGF binding peptide not the function the randomized peptides should maintain. Thus, there is insufficient written description as to the identity of NGF binding peptides. Consequently, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of NGF binding peptides.

The specification as filed does not provide adequate written description support for NGF binding peptides. What is the composition of such peptides?. In order to maintain a functional activity, a core structure would have to be identified and maintained in all of the NGF binding peptides. No such structure has been elucidated in the specification. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. The sequence itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.,

Art Unit: 1643

18 USPQ2d 1016. Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed. (See page 1117.) The specification does not clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed. (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.).

Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, & 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 1643

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6919426. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to a composition of matter comprising and Fc domain and a peptide capable of inhibiting NGF activity. The difference between the two inventions is the scope. Specifically, the patent not only reads on Fc-NGF peptide compositions, but also compositions wherein the Fc is PEG, a lipid, etc. Furthermore, the NGF peptides in the patent are limited to SEQ ID NO. 202, 211, 219, 221, 231, 237 and 272 whereas the NGF peptides in the instant application are any NGF peptide. Thus, the scope of the patent and the instant application are different and yet do overlap.

Claims 1-7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory provisional obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-5, 8, 10-14, 15, 27-28, 31, 34-38, 48-49, 68-69, 72, 74-79, 89-90, 93, 95-100, 110, 112-112, 116, 118-123, 144-149 of US application no. 11/127702. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to a composition of matter comprising and Fc domain and peptides capable of inhibiting NGF activity. The difference between the two inventions is the scope. Specifically, the patent not only reads on Fc-NGF peptide compositions, but also

Art Unit: 1643

compositions wherein the Fc is PEG, a lipid, etc. The Fc region denoted as SEQ ID NO. 60 in the application is the same as the Fc region denoted as SEQ ID NO. 2 of the instant application. Furthermore, the NGF peptides in the patent are SEQ ID No. 276 (which reads on a multitude of peptides), 274 (which reads on a multitude of peptides), 208, 209, 224, 233, 234 etc., whereas the NGF peptides in the instant application are any NGF peptide. Thus, the scope of the patent and the instant application are different and yet do overlap.

Claims 1-7 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims of commonly assigned 6918426 or claims 4-5, 8, 10-14, 15, 27-28, 31, 34-38, 48-49, 68-69, 72, 74-79, 89-90, 93, 95-100, 110, 112-112, 116, 118-123, 144-149 of US application no. 11/127702. Specifically, the reasons have been discussed above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned 6919426 or US application 11/127702, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela J. Huff whose telephone number is 571-272-0834. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 5:30am to 2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sheela J Huff
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1643